

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 4. This sheet, which includes Fig. 4, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application, as presently amended, and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 are pending in the present application; Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9-10 are canceled; and Claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 are amended by way of the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.¹ Thus, no new matter is presented.

In the outstanding Official Action, the drawings and abstract were objected to because of minor informalities; Claims 1, 4-5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite; Claims 5-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter; and Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fowlow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,138, hereinafter “Fowlow”).

In response to the objection to the drawings and specification, the specification and Fig. 4 are amended to address the matters cited in the outstanding Official Action. Specifically, Fig. 4 was objected to because reference numeral “50” was not mentioned in the specification. Accordingly, reference numeral “50” is removed from Fig. 4. Further, at page 12, line 12, “an input unit 54” is amended to read “an input unit 84” and “the memory” at page 12, line 16 is amended to recite “the memory 82”, as recommended in the outstanding Official Action. Further, the abstract is amended to not exceed 150 words in length and to remove legal phraseology.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings and specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite because the outstanding Official Action states that the term “‘outside’ is vague”. In

¹ Claims 1, 5, 8 and 11 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 5 respectively.

response the pending claims are amended to recite “a user” instead of “outside”, as recommended in the outstanding Official Action.

Accordingly Applicants respectfully submits that the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Claim 5 is amended to recite “said method being realized by steps operated on a computer system”, thus defining a structural relationship between the claimed method and a computer system. Further, Claim 11 is amended to recite “computer readable recording medium having stored thereon...a plurality of software components configured to be executed by a computer”, which also clearly defines a structural relationship between the computer program and the medium.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 5 and 8 state novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Specifically, independent Claims 1, 5 and 8 relate to a system and method for building a software program by connecting a plurality of software components. A plurality of software components are displayed as icons on a pallet area of a tool screen. An editing area of the tool screen is then manipulated by a user who can combine a plurality of the icons corresponding to the respective software components. The claimed system and method allow a specific group of associated software components to be set as a single composite component on the basis of instructions input by the user. The composite component is then registered as an icon corresponding to a new software component in the pallet area of the tool screen.

Thus, since a specific group of software components associated with each other are set as a single composite component on the basis of instructions received from a user, it is possible to cause a software program to be a component at a desired level, so that it is possible to efficiently build, manage and reuse a larger software program. In addition, since the composite component thus set can be registered as an icon corresponding to a new composite component in the pallet area of the tool screen, the newly registered composite component can be reused as a software component in the editing area of the tool screen when a software program or another composite component is built on the tool screen.

Turning to the applied reference, Fowlow (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,138), as shown in Fig. 5, describes a visual composition tool for constructing application programs in which a plurality of parts corresponding to components selected from a catalog facility (550) are linked in a central portion (520) of the editor (500), so that the parts corresponding to various pre-existing code for the implementation of a composed application. In addition, the editor (500) is adapted to set the connections or interfaces between the combined code objects and other code objects using plugs (544) and sockets (546).² The editor (500) further includes a region (512) for setting attribute values of selected parts.³

However, the method of Fowlow merely describes creating the composition of parts to produce program source files. As discussed above, Fowlow simply describes using “plugs” and “sockets” to combine various components selected from a cataloging facility and that the segmented combination of components exist as the application.⁴ Thus, Fowlow fails to teach or suggest *setting a specific group of software components, which are associated with each other, as a single composite component*, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 5 and 8.

² Fowlow at col. 10, line 53-col. 11, line 28.

³ Id. at col. 10, lines 43-52.

⁴ Id. at col. 11, lines 29-63.

Further, amended independent Claims 1, 5 and 8 recite “*registering the composite component...as an icon corresponding to a new software component in the pallet area of the tool screen*”. The outstanding Official Action cites col. 3, lines 48-52, col. 4, lines 18-21, and col. 15, line 65-col. 16 line 7, of Fowlow as addressing this above-noted claim feature. However, the cited portions of Fowlow simply describe that “pre-existing” icons exist and that these icons may be manipulated and attached to one another using the plugs and sockets, as discussed above. At no point does Fowlow teach or suggest that a combination of icons may be registered as a composite component and used as an icon corresponding to a new software component of the user interface, as recited in amended Claims 1, 5 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by claims 1, 5, 8 and 11 is definite and patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21's\219014-US\219014 AM 6.22.05.DOC